



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/639,196	08/15/2000	Arto Palin	4208-4353	1563
27123	7590	07/30/2008		
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P. 3 WORLD FINANCIAL CENTER NEW YORK, NY 10281-2101			EXAMINER NGUYEN, HAU H	
			ART UNIT 2628	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 07/30/2008	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTOPatentCommunications@Morganfinnegan.com
Shopkins@Morganfinnegan.com
jmedina@Morganfinnegan.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/639,196	Applicant(s) PALIN, ARTO	
	Examiner HAU H. NGUYEN	Art Unit 2628	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 April 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 43-62 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 43-62 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

The response filed on 4/25/2008 has been fully considered in preparing for this Office Action.

Specification Objection

1. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: The specification does not give any support or definition to the claim subject matter in claim 54; in particular, there is no definition of "*an article of manufacture comprising a computer readable medium containing computer readable code*" found in the Specification to support this claimed feature.

Since Applicant does not provide the required support or definition to the claimed subject matter above, the objection to the specification is maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the

Art Unit: 2628

reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3. Claims 43-50, and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Harrison et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,064,420, "Harrison", hereinafter).

As per claim 43, as shown in Figs. 9A-9D, Harrison teaches *an apparatus comprising:*

a processor (item 38, Fig. 9A);

a memory coupled to the processor and configured for storing data provided by the processor (memory 40);

a splitting application configured to split received data including at least first image information and second image information into at least two data parts, wherein the first image information and the second image information are for displaying at least two substantially different images (see Fig. 8, col. 11, lines 43-64, splitting image data for associated recipients (display devices), where the split portions of the received image are different, such as two different game scenes, see col. 5, lines 12-18); and

a wireless short-range transmitter (102, Fig. 9A) coupled to the processor and configured to transmit at least one of the at least two data parts wirelessly to an external display device for displaying images corresponding to at least the first image information (col. 11, lines 50-64); and

a display coupled to the processor and configured for receiving at least one data part not transmitted by the wireless short-range transmitter and displaying images corresponding to at least the second image information (please refer again to Fig. 9A, for example, primary display

Art Unit: 2628

42 coupled to the processor 38 to render the primary data for displaying on the primary display 42, and transmit the associated data to a hand held device 200),

wherein the images displayed on the external display device and the display coupled to the processor are substantially different (as cited above, different recipients receive different game information). (It should be noted that in rendering the claim limitations, the examiner not only relies on the cited passages, but also in association with the whole disclosure).

As per claim 44, Harrison further teaches *a receiver for receiving a signal comprising data including at least the first image information and the second image information* (as cited above, the receiver 36 receives media data comprising primary data (for display 42) and associated data (for hand held display device) (see also abstract, and col. 4, lines 1-12).

As per claim 45, Harrison further teaches *the receiver is a wide-area network receiver* (see col. 6, lines 51-55).

As per claim 46, Harrison teaches *the memory comprises a buffer adapted to buffer the received signal to provide time for the splitting application to split the received data into the at least two parts* (see Fig. 13, col. 12, lines 30-54).

As per claim 47, *the processor is configured to forward to the display coupled to the processor the at least one part of the received data that is not transmitted to the external display device* (see Fig. 9A, the primary data not transmitted to the hand held device 200 is forwarded to the primary data display 42).

As per claim 48, referring again to Fig. 13, Harrison teaches *the splitting application is configured to split received data into at least two parts based on headers in the received data*

Art Unit: 2628

(i.e. based on the identification (*party ID*) of the targeted recipients, see also Fig. 12, col. 12, lines 13-29).

As per claim 49, as cited above with reference to claim 43, Harrison teaches *a method comprising:*

obtaining data, including at least first image information and second image information, in frames (received data includes primary data stream and associated data stream, see col. 4, lines 40-58);

splitting the obtained data into at least two data parts, wherein the first image information and the second image information are for displaying at least two substantially different images (as cited above, see Fig. 8, col. 11, lines 43-54, splitting the received data into the primary data and associated data, where primary data and the associated data are substantially differ, such as different game scenes, col. 5, lines 12-18); *and*

transmitting at least one of the at least two data parts wirelessly to an external display device for displaying images corresponding to at least the first image information (Fig. 9A, transmitting associated data to a hand held display device 200, see col. 11, lines 55-64),

wherein a coupled display is configured to receive at least one data part not transmitted wirelessly and display images corresponding to at least the second image information (primary data display 42 displaying primary data, which is not transmitted), *and*

wherein the images displayed on the external display device (displaying associated data on the hand held device 200, see col. 12, line 66 to col. 13, line 11) *and the coupled display are substantially different* (as cited above).

As per claim 50, Harrison teaches *the obtained data is received from a receiver* (such as receiver 36, Fig. 9A).

As per claim 53, as cited above, Harrison also teaches *the splitting of obtained data into at least two parts is based on headers in the obtained data* (i.e. based on the identification (*party ID*) of the targeted recipients, see also Fig. 12, col. 12, lines 13-29).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 51-52, 54-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harrison et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,064,420).

As per claim 51, as cited above with reference to Fig. 13, Harrison further teaches *buffering a received signal to provide time for a splitting application in a computer to split obtained data into the at least two parts*.

Harrison does not explicitly teach the computer, which receives and splits data into at least two parts, is a mobile terminal. However, it is well known in the art that a computer can be a mobile terminal, such as a laptop. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the computer system into a mobile terminal in order to obtain a more compact computing system.

As per claim 52, as cited above, Harrison teaches *forwarding to a display of a computer 35 (Fig. 9A) a part of the split data that is not transmitted to the external display device (i.e. forwarding primary data to the display 42).*

Harrison does not explicitly teach the computer, which receives and splits data into at least two parts, is a mobile terminal. However, it is well known in the art that a computer can be a mobile terminal, such as a laptop. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the computer system into a mobile terminal in order to obtain a more compact computing system.

As per claim 54, with reference to claims 43 and 49, Harrison teaches *an article of manufacture comprising a computer readable medium containing computer readable code, which when executed by a processor causes the processor to split data, including at least first image information and second image information, obtained by a computer into at least two data parts, wherein the first image information and the second image information are for displaying at least two substantially different images and transmit at least one of the at least two data parts wirelessly to an external display device for displaying images corresponding to at least the first image information,*

wherein a coupled display is configured to receive at least one data part not transmitted wirelessly and display images corresponding to at least the second image information, and wherein the images displayed on the external display device and the coupled display are substantially different.

Harrison does not explicitly teach the computer, which receives and splits data into at least two parts, is a mobile terminal. However, it is well known in the art that a computer can be

a mobile terminal, such as a laptop. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the computer system into a mobile terminal in order to obtain a more compact computing system.

Claim 55, which is similar in scope to claim 50, is thus rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 56, which is similar in scope to claim 51, is thus rejected under the same rationale.

As per claim 57, as cited above with reference to claim 43 and 54, Harrison teaches *a system comprising:*

a computer 35 and an external display device, wherein the computer comprises a processor 38;

a memory coupled to the processor and configured for storing data provided by the processor 40;

a splitting application configured to split received data including at least first image information and second image information into at least two data parts, wherein the first image information and the second image information are for displaying at least two substantially different images; and

a wireless short-range transmitter coupled to the processor and configured to transmit at least one of the at least two data parts wirelessly to an external display device for displaying images corresponding to at least the first image information (col. 11, lines 43-64); and

a display coupled to the processor and configured for receiving at least one data part not transmitted by the wireless short-range transmitter and displaying images corresponding to at least the second image information, wherein the images displayed on the external display device and the display coupled to the processor are substantially different (as cited above).

Harrison does not explicitly teach the computer, which receives and splits data into at least two parts, is a mobile terminal. However, it is well known in the art that a computer can be a mobile terminal, such as a laptop. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the computer system into a mobile terminal in order to obtain a more compact computing system.

As per claim 58, as cited above, Harrison teaches *a receiver for receiving a signal comprising data including at least the first image information and the second image information* (receive 36, Fig. 9a, to receive the primary data and associated data).

Claim 59, which is similar in scope to claim 45, is thus rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 60, which is similar in scope to claim 51, is thus rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 61, which is similar in scope to claim 52, is thus rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 62, which is similar in scope to claim 53, is thus rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 43-62 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

Art Unit: 2628

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hau H. Nguyen whose telephone number is: 571-272-7787. The examiner can normally be reached on MON-FRI from 8:30-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kee Tung can be reached on (571) 272-7794.

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Hau H Nguyen/

Examiner, Art Unit 2628

Application/Control Number: 09/639,196
Art Unit: 2628

Page 11

/Kee M Tung/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2628